

FINAL NAVAL AIR STATION ALAMEDA RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING SUMMARY

Building 1, Suite 140, Community Conference Room
Alameda Point
Alameda, California

November 5, 2002

ATTENDEES

See attached list.

MEETING SUMMARY

I. Approval of Minutes

Michael John Torrey, Co-Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:36 p.m.

Mr. Torrey asked for comments on the October 1, 2002, Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting Minutes. The minutes were approved, with the following corrections:

- Lea Loizos asked if the date for the Sites 14 and 15 Record of Decision on Page 5 was misprinted. Andrew Dick, Department of the Navy (Navy) confirmed that it was, and the date will be revised from September 30, 2004, to September 30, 2003.
- Ms. Loizos also asked if the 1,800 rounds found during the surface sweep for unexploded ordnance at Site 1 on Page 5 were disposed of at the Site 1 landfill. Mike McClelland, Navy, clarified that they were disposed of off site. Therefore, the second to last sentence in the third paragraph on Page 5 will be revised to read "...1,800 spent rounds that were demilitarized and disposed of off site."
- George Humphreys stated that the last sentence of the first full paragraph on Page 6 inaccurately portrayed his opinion on the possible risks from radioactive material. That sentence will be omitted.

II. Co-Chair Announcements

Mr. McClelland made the following announcements:

The Draft Site 14 Feasibility Study was submitted on October 15, 2002, and is available for review in the RAB information repository. The deadline for comments on that document is December 15, 2002.

The polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbon Area 1 Site Investigation report is due on December 15, 2002; comments will be due January 1, 2003.

Mr. McClelland stated that the Base Realignment and Closure Cleanup Team (BCT) Activities would be moved up on the agenda, because Judy Huang, Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), will be unable to attend the entire meeting.

III. BCT Activities

Ms. Huang provided the following report on BCT activities for October 2002:

- The October 2002 BCT meeting was held on October 15, 2002. The BCT discussed agency comments on the Draft Sites 14 and 15 Remedial Investigation (RI) Report. Many of the comments were resolved.
- A Draft Technical Memorandum regarding Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA)-permitted sites and the Draft Site 14 FS were submitted for agency review.
- The agencies met with the Navy and the vendor to discuss agency concerns regarding the application of Fenton's Reagent during the chemical oxidation pilot study at Sites 9, 11, 16, and 21. Reaction control, off-gassing monitoring, and potential explosion hazards were among the topics discussed. Most agency concerns have been addressed, however, a few continue to be negotiated.

Mr. Torrey, Community Co-Chair, stated that the phases of the water tower removal action should be documented on film. Mr. McClelland stated that a still photograph log is being prepared.

IV. RAB Elections

Bert Morgan stated that both he and Mr. Humphreys accept their nominations, made in response to the recommendation made by Mr. Torrey, for Co-Chair and Vice Co-Chair, respectively. No other nominations were made; therefore, the RAB unanimously voted to elect Mr. Morgan and Mr. Humphreys as Co-Chair and Vice Co-Chair respectively.

V. Early Transfer Status

Elizabeth Johnson, City of Alameda (City), stated that a meeting with all parties involved in the potential early transfer of property at Alameda Point was held on October 23, 2002. Agencies in attendance included RWQCB, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), and the State Lands Commission. The goal of the meeting was to discuss the major issues affecting early transfers and to establish an overall picture of how all of the components eventually will come together.

Ms. Johnson introduced Barry Steinberg (outside legal counsel to the City), Randy Brandt (Levine Fricke, contracted to conduct due diligence for the developer), and Ted Splitter (Northgate Environmental, environmental consultant to the City). Mr. Steinberg gave the following presentation on the laws governing transfer and early transfer of federal property.

The starting point for cleanup of any federal property is the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA). Each deed entered into for the transfer

of federal property by the U.S. government (U.S.) to any person or entity shall contain the following:

- Information regarding the type and quantity of hazardous materials present; the time at which storage, release, or disposal of those materials took place; and a description of any remedial action taken
- A covenant warranting that: (a) all necessary remedial action to protect human health and the environment with respect to the above-mentioned substances remaining on the property has been taken prior to the date of transfer and (b) any additional remedial action found to be necessary following the date of transfer shall be conducted by the U.S.

Three problems are associated with these conditions: (1) the covenant establishes a condition precedent to transfer by deed; (2) remedial action requires lengthy investigation, site characterization, and remedy selection and execution; and (3) until "all remedial action" has been taken, the inability to transfer by deed inhibits financial investment and economic development. Because CERCLA does not allow any transfer of deed prior to completion of all necessary remedial action, transfer of many properties has been delayed substantially, if not indefinitely. In some cases, it is not profitable to take the necessary measures to transfer property at all, so the process is halted and the property is not developed. In general, lenders will not invest in development until a deed has been transferred, because the risk is too high. In the case of Alameda Point, even if a transfer is potentially profitable, and therefore intended, the process of investment and development is delayed for years. For these reasons, Congress identified an objective in 1996 to develop a legislative program that will facilitate the reuse of contaminated property and eliminate the differences in requirements for transfer of federal, public, and private property. At the root of the problem leading to this legislation is the fact that remedy selection and execution are too slow and communities want to speed up the process of transfer, but without sacrificing the integrity of cleanup. One option would be to lease the properties prior to finishing cleanup activities. If properties were to be leased prior to completion of remediation, the government would run the risk of being held accountable for additional contamination caused by tenants. In addition, communities feared that after properties are leased, the U.S. would not follow through on its obligation to clean them up. For instance, if the U.S. were to engage in war, money from environmental budgets would probably be spent on military costs, leaving insufficient funds to support cleanup of leased properties. In addition, without title to properties, it is unlikely that developers would be able to secure loans.

The answer to these problems that Congress developed is what is known as the "CERCLA Deferred Covenant." The first portion of this five-part CERCLA amendment is that the CERCLA warranty may be deferred by the EPA Administrator, with concurrence from the governor of the state where the property is located, if the Administrator determines that the property is suitable for transfer based on the following conditions:

- The property is suitable for the intended use, and the intended use is consistent with protection of human health and the environment (HH&E).
- The deed or other governing agreement between the U.S. and the transferee contains the assurances set forth in the CERCLA warranty.

- The federal agency has provided notice by publication in a local newspaper of the proposed transfer location and has allowed a minimum of 30 days for submission of public comments regarding the suitability of the property for transfer.
- Deferral and transfer will not delay the necessary response actions.

The first condition would apply to a site, for example, that requires only groundwater monitoring. If there is a beneficial use for the land that does not involve the groundwater, then it is possible that the property could be transferred and reused without compromising HH&E.

The fact that the language used to describe the determination of the EPA Administrator and the subject of public comment is the same ("suitability of the property for transfer") indicates that the type and quality of information disseminated to the public should closely reflect that on which the EPA Administrator has based the decision.

Mr. Torrey asked what the result would be if public comments did not align with EPA's decision. Mr. Steinberg stated that the role of public comment in the case of early transfer is the same as it is throughout the CERCLA process, which is advisory. Therefore, public comments do not have to necessarily agree with EPA's decision. However, if there is an overwhelming response from the public indicating that they do not agree with the decision, elected officials should give that response due consideration.

Kurt Peterson asked if it is fair to assume that 30 days is always enough time to respond to major decisions. Mr. Steinberg clarified that there is a 30-day minimum, but that longer review periods often are necessary to reflect on the complexity of the site and the factors involved in determining its suitability for early transfer.

The second part of the amendment lists the response action assurances. The deed or other governing agreement for a proposed transfer must contain the following assurances:

- Restrictions will be placed on use to ensure protection of HH&E.
- Restrictions will be placed on use to ensure that RIs, response action, and oversight activities will not be disrupted.
- Necessary response actions will be taken.
- Schedules for investigation and completion of necessary response action, as approved by the appropriate regulatory agency, will be identified.
- The Federal agency will submit budget requests that adequately address schedules, subject to Congressional authorizations and appropriations.

The third part of the amendment requires that when all necessary response actions have been taken to protect HH&E, the U.S. will deliver a document containing a warranty that all such response actions have been taken, which is considered to satisfy the requirements of the CERCLA warranty.

The fourth part of the amendment states that the deferral of warranty does not in any way diminish or affect the rights or obligations of the federal government.

Jo-Lynne Lee asked if the warranty would be void if the lessee contributed additional contamination. Mr. Steinberg reassured the RAB that there is no way to void the CERCLA warranty. The government would still be held accountable, however, they would be allowed to pursue legal actions against the liable party.

While the government can never be relieved of the responsibility for funding the cleanup, there the transfer the funds to a State, local government, or other recipient is possible under 31 U.S. Code 6305. This statute indicates that a cooperative agreement may be established whereby the State, local government, or other recipient receives the necessary funds from the U.S. and takes over the responsibility for conducting all cleanup activities. Cooperative agreements cannot be entered into with a private, for-profit organization. However, municipal governments may hire private developers to assume responsibility for cleanup on behalf of the municipality, following transfer of the deed. This arrangement is precisely how the Alameda Point Community Partners (APCP) would conduct the cleanup for the City in the case of early transfer.

A new insurance mechanism is available to ensure that developers complete property cleanup during early transfers. For example, if the developer were to suddenly go bankrupt prior to completion of the cleanup, the insurance company would fund the remainder of cleanup activities. For a fee, (paid by the developer) the insurance company will take the risk on behalf of the City. The final assurance that remediation will be conducted is that the federal government is always liable.

The structure of the relationship between the developer, the Navy, and the insurance carrier is as follows. A deductible is held in an escrow account, or a letter of credit is submitted; contractual remediation costs are covered by security, labor, and materials surety bonds issued by the government; personal injury, property damage, transportation, and defense are included in the pollution legal liability coverage; cost cap insurance is used to cover remediation costs in excess of the bonds; and the responsibility for any unknown, undiscovered contamination requiring remediation in excess of the cost cap falls on the Navy.

One of the main benefits to this arrangement is that lengthy delays can be avoided. By allowing the transferee to undertake the remediation, the process is not delayed by a deed transfer prior to completion of remedial actions. Another advantage is that combining remediation and development activities can often significantly increase the efficiency of the two processes and eliminate wasteful spending. For example, if soil excavation is required as a remediation measure at a site that will later be excavated for construction of a foundation for a new building, combining remediation and development prevents the need to excavate the same site twice. Remedial and development actions can be taken concurrently.

Ms. Lee asked what the community's ability to comment is by law. Mr. Steinberg stated that with or without early transfer, and regardless of whether the Navy or the developer is conducting the cleanup, the lead remedial agency (EPA in the case of a national priorities list site such as Alameda Point) always has the final decision on remedial actions. Therefore, the community's opportunity for input that exists currently will not change in the case of early transfer. Only the responsible party, not the decision-making entity, changes. The existence of a RAB is a requirement of CERCLA, not just the Navy, and the developer will have to adhere to all of the CERCLA requirements exactly as the Navy does.

Dale Smith stated that there is a concern among community members that a private developer with separate interests may be unconcerned with community input. Mr. Steinberg emphasized that all decision-making power will remain with the EPA and will not be transferred to the developer when the responsibility of conducting the cleanup is transferred and that EPA will always be concerned with community input.

Mr. Peterson asked if there are potential liabilities for the City in the process of early transfer. Mr. Steinberg stated that it is his job to make sure the City is not liable for anything at all. The insurance company covers all liability, and the developer, not the city, is responsible for the cost of the insurance policies. In addition, nothing about deferred conveyance (early transfer) changes the ultimate responsibility of the federal government.

Randy Brandt, Levine Fricke, presented the following information regarding life after transfer on behalf of Aiden Barry, APCP, who was unable to attend the meeting. Levine Fricke was hired by APCP to: (1) conduct due diligence, (2) study the activities conducted at Alameda Point, (3) identify the current environmental status of the property, and (4) identify activities that are needed to complete the remediation process. The goal of this procedure is to determine how the developer will handle the cleanup, what responsibilities they will assume, and how the community will be involved.

Under current regulatory status, the Navy has full responsibility for environmental cleanup. The Federal Facilities Agreement (FFA) ties the Navy and EPA to all Superfund issues. The RCRA permit in place at Alameda ties the Navy and DTSC to all RCRA issues. RWQCB ties the Navy to all total petroleum hydrocarbon (TPH) issues through the basewide TPH program. This status will always remain. Currently, to maintain a system of checks and balances, there are several regular meetings among the major groups involved in the cleanup process. The BCT meets monthly to monitor the progress of the CERCLA, RCRA, and TPH programs; the RAB meets monthly to monitor the progress of Navy commitments; and the Alameda Reuse and Redevelopment Authority (ARRA) and APCP meet periodically to interface with the Navy on environmental due diligence issues.

Mr. Peterson asked if those meetings are open to the public. Ms. Johnson stated that the BCT meetings are open; however, the meetings with APCP are not, because they are real estate negotiations. Ms. Smith asked if there would be public hearings regarding the issues discussed in meetings not open to the public, because they directly affect the community. Ms. Johnson responded that when the results of those meetings are presented to the City Council, the public would be involved in the same manner as they are in the decision-making process for other City issues. Rezsini Jaulus suggested that the appropriate contacts for community members might be the City Council representatives. Ms. Johnson agreed and added that a community outreach program will be implemented that will include public workshops, mailings, and a variety of other measures to keep the public informed and involved in the process.

Mr. Morgan asked which properties are of interest to the developers. Ms. Johnson stated that the developer is interested in the whole base, with the exception of the Federal agency to agency (FED) transfer area (future U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Reserve), the golf course area, the sports complex site, and East Housing. The rest of the base is included in the area proposed for early transfer. The City is proposing itself as developer of the golf course and sports complex areas.

Mr. Brandt explained that the early transfer process will proceed in a phased approach. The new process will mirror many aspects of the current process as conducted by the Navy and that all remedial goals and objectives will remain the same. Remediation will continue on the portions of the base remaining under Navy ownership in parallel with remediation conducted under ARRA/APCP.

Following transfer, ARRA/APCP will assume the responsibility for cleanup of the early transfer parcels. Therefore, future documents and contracts will link the FFA between the Navy and EPA to ARRA/APCP for all Superfund issues. A consent agreement will be established between the Navy/ARRA/APCP and DTSC for all issues within DTSC's jurisdiction.

Ms. Lee asked if that relationship would be brought to the City Council. Mr. Steinberg stated that the City's primary governance responsibility is to protect HH&E and it will look to EPA for guidance in doing so. The developer, with whom they share certain business relationships and common goals, has different objectives and very different risks and responsibilities.

Mr. Peterson asked for clarification that the City would require specific language to be included in the insurance policy between the developer and the insurance company to ensure that the City will be covered under all circumstances. Mr. Steinberg stated that EPA guidance specifically addresses that issue and that no insurance policy would be signed if it did not adequately state the City's coverage.

Mr. Humphreys asked if the City would have to provide its own insurance policy for the Northwest Territories. Mr. Steinberg stated that they would in the case of an early transfer.

Mr. Humphreys asked why the City has not been involved in the early transfer discussions. Mr. McClelland stated that the FED transfer area is not being considered for early transfer; it will be transferred directly from one Federal agency to another by standard transfer procedures.

Following transfer, a similar set of checks and balances will remain in place to govern the developer's management of the cleanup of early transfer parcels. A BCT-equivalent group will continue to meet monthly to monitor progress of the CERCLA, RCRA, and TPH programs. A group equivalent to the current RAB will continue to meet monthly to monitor the progress of cleanup commitments. All public involvement aspects of CERCLA/RCRA are required by law and will continue to be met. Additional tools to assist in communication with the public, such as web pages, are being explored for development.

The developer's goals are to: (1) deliver a quality development with minimal long-term environmental liability; (2) maintain remediation standards protective of HH&E, as required by law; and (3) conduct remediation in a more expeditious and cost-effective manner than the current process allows.

Ms. Johnson stated that a community participation plan is being drafted for facilitating communication and outlining the specifics of exactly how the RAB will be involved in the early transfer process.

Mr. Peterson stated that he wanted the City to be aware that the community would like to provide input to all development plans that may impact the City's current reuse plan.

Ms. Loizos asked if the City and the developer have estimated a timeline for the early transfer process. Mr. Brandt responded that the developer hopes to access the property by 2005; however, the Navy estimates that the cleanup will not be complete until 2010. Some portions could be available sooner. The due diligence report will be submitted by the end of the week of November 11, 2002. Following submission of that document, discussions will ensue and negotiations should be underway by the end of the year. Anne-Marie Cook reminded everyone that there is still a great deal of uncertainty for sites that are early in the RI process.

Mr. Peterson asked for the status of the East Housing area relative to the rest of the base in the transfer process. Mr. McClelland stated that it has been transferred by standard transfer procedures.

Mr. Humphreys asked if the due diligence report will be available to the public. Mr. Brandt stated that it will not be available immediately and he is unsure if it will be released to the public.

Mr. Morgan asked about the affects of funding availability from Congress to the Navy on early transfer negotiations. Mr. McClelland stated that funding is a key issue and that if the Navy does not receive the funds from Congress, then early transfer cannot proceed. Mare Island is being funded in a phased approach to deal with budget constraints, which may be an alternative at Alameda Point.

Tony Dover asked if it is possible that insurance might not be available if funding for the cleanup were to run out. Mr. Steinberg stated that it could potentially happen. It is advised that a third-party assessment be sought.

Ms. Loizos stated that the Mare Island RAB assured themselves a similar position after early transfer by requesting that the Navy allow the developer to sit in on their meetings, which were still required. In this manner, the RAB meetings were used as a forum. The developers are required to submit fact sheets and provide funding similar to the Technical Assistance for Public Participation (TAPP) Grant funds provided by the Navy. Ms. Cook added that as a condition of early transfer, EPA would require the continued involvement of the RAB, and Ms. Johnson stated that the City would ensure that someone would cover the expenses.

VI. Sites 14 and 15 Focus Group Report

Ms. Loizos stated that the Focus Group provided comments and held a meeting to discuss comments with the Navy on October 15, 2002. Resolution was met on several issues; however, others are still pending and may be revised based on agency comments. Ms. Smith stated that EPA had discussed conducting a baseline ecological risk assessment (ERA) and wanted to know how an FS could be conducted without a full ERA. Ms. Loizos stated that an FS could be prepared without conducting an RI. Ms. Cook stated that EPA submitted comments on the ERA included in the Draft Sites 14 and 15 RI Report and the Navy agreed to revise the ERA. EPA will review the revised ERA to ensure that concerns have been adequately addressed. Ms. Smith asked when the revised ERA would be available for review. Ms. Cook stated that the Draft Final Sites 14 and 15 RI Report is scheduled for submittal on December 15, 2002, and that the Draft Final FS may include additional alternatives (hotspot remediation followed by monitored natural attenuation), as suggested by EPA.

Ms. Smith stated that it appeared that the cost estimate for the second alternative discussed in the FS appeared to be significantly under budgeted and that EPA should comment on it.

It was determined that a date and time for the next Focus Group meeting would be decided by e-mail.

VII. Community and RAB Comment Period

To clarify some confusion regarding a discussion at the October 2002 RAB meeting about the rate of decay of radium in the landfill at Site 1, Mr. Humphreys presented the following information.

Radium is a natural radioactive element that results from the decay of thorium and uranium. It has four isotopes; the longest lasting form is Radium 226, which has a half-life of 1,620 years. Uranium 238 has a half-life of 4.5 million years, so there is virtually a continual source of degrading forms of radioactive material in nature. Once the radium has been extracted from the parent uranium and thorium sources, the radium will decay in accordance with half-life of the respective radium isotopes. The other three radium isotopes have the following half-lives:

Radium 228: 6.7 years
Radium 224: 3.64 days
Radium 223: 11.2 days

Mr. Humphreys stated that he believes that the predominant isotope in the landfill is most likely Radium 226 because it has been in the ground for at least 20 or 30 years. The next level of decay from the radium isotopes is radon, a gas. In addition, Mr. Humphreys noted that there has been a debate over the targeted cleanup level for radiation exposure; EPA and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission had negotiated levels in the range of 15 to 25 millirems per year (mR/yr) exposure. To put this level in perspective, Mr. Humphreys stated that background levels of exposure from other natural sources are often in the range of 300 mR/yr. Therefore, the levels that have been discussed for Alameda Point are significantly lower than what many people are already exposed to (and would be difficult to attain), particularly with saltwater intrusion (seawater contains radioactive potassium 40). Mr. Humphreys feels that the more important factor is the location of the radioactive material within the landfill. Mr. McClelland added that when radium sources are more than 15 to 18 inches below ground surface, they cannot even be detected. Mr. Humphreys stated that to clean up to levels so close to background, very sensitive, high-tech equipment would be required.

Jim Leach stated that the advantage of removing the landfill in the manner he explained at the October 2002 RAB meeting would be that the potential migration that could occur during the RI/FS process would be avoided.

Mr. Humphreys emphasized that the risk of ingestion and inhalation are the most immediate concerns. Mr. Leach added that rabbits had been captured many miles from areas where they had ingested radioactive material, and therefore, presented a risk to animals higher on the food chain.

Finally, Mr. Humphreys stated that California had been part of an organization that had proposed a low-level radioactive storage site that was not approved because of the risks to groundwater. This may suggest that there will not be much support for a low-level radioactive storage on the San Francisco Bay.

Michael Shields, U.S. Coast Guard, informed the RAB that he has been trying to promote interest among the residents of the Coast Guard Housing Area in joining the RAB.

Mr. McClelland stated that he received the TAPP grant application; it has been approved and is moving through the contracting process.

Mr. Torrey asked for an update on the status of the 2002 revision of the Community Relations Plan. Tracy Craig, Tetra Tech EM Inc., stated that the draft version of the document is scheduled for submittal on December 30, 2002.

Steve Edde reminded RAB members that the annual RAB holiday party will be held at the December 2002 RAB meeting and everyone should bring a potluck food or drink item. A reminder will be included in the mid-monthly mailing.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:47 p.m.

ATTACHMENT A

**NAVAL AIR STATION ALAMEDA
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING AGENDA
November 5, 2002**

(One Page)

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD

NAVAL AIR STATION, ALAMEDA

AGENDA

5 NOVEMBER, 2002 6:30 PM

ALAMEDA POINT – BUILDING 1 – SUITE 140

COMMUNITY CONFERENCE ROOM

(FROM PARKING LOT ON W MIDWAY AVE, ENTER THROUGH MIDDLE WING)

<u>TIME</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PRESENTER</u>
6:30 - 6:35	Approval of Minutes	Michael-John Torrey
6:35 - 6:45	Co-Chair Announcements	Co-Chairs
6:45 - 7:05	RAB Elections	Michael-John Torrey
7:05 - 8:05	Early Transfer Status	APCP & Elizabeth Johnson
8:05 - 8:15	Sites 14 & 15 Focus Group Report	Doug DeHaan
8:15 - 8:20	BCT Activities	Judy Huang
8:20 - 8:30	Community & RAB Comment Period Community & RAB	
	RAB Meeting Adjournment	
8:30 - 9:00	Informal Discussions with the BCT	

ATTACHMENT B

**NAVAL AIR STATION ALAMEDA
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING SIGN-IN SHEETS**

(Four Pages)

**ALAMEDA POINT
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD
Monthly Attendance Roster for 2002**

Date: November 5, 2002

Please initial by your name

RAB MEMBERS	JAN	FEB	MARCH	APRIL	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC
Ingrid Baur	X	X		X		X		X	X	X		
Clem Burnap												
Ardella Dailey		*			X	X				X		
Nick DeBenedittis												
Douglas deHaan		X	X		X	X			X	X		
Tony Dover	X		X				X				X	
George Humphreys	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
James D. Leach	X	X	*	*	X	X	X		*	X	X	
Jo-Lynne Lee	X	**	X		**			*			X	
Lea Loizos	X	X	X	X		X	X	*	X	X	X	
Bert Morgan	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	*	X	X	
Ken O' Donoghue												
Kurt Peterson				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Kevin Reilly	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Bill Smith (attending for Mary Sutter)	X	X	X	X								
Dale Smith (attending for Mary Sutter)				X	X	X			X	X	X	
Lyn Stirewalt	X	X	*		*	X		*	*			
Mary Sutter												
Jean Sweeney						**		X	X	X		
Jim Sweeney						**	X	X	X	X		
Luann Tetirick		X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X		
Michael John Torrey	X	X	*	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	

* Denotes excused absense

COMMUNITY MEMBERS	JAN	FEB	MARCH	APRIL	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC
Dana Kokubaun												
Golden Gate Audubon Society												
Betsy P. Elgar												
Debbie Collins	X	X					X					
David Rheinheimer								X	X			
REGULATORY AND OTHER AGENCIES	JAN	FEB	MARCH	APRIL	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC
Anna-Marie Cook (EPA)	X	*	X	X	X		X	*	X	X	X	
David Cooper (EPA)	X	X	X					X				
Judy Huang (RWQCB)								X	*	X	X	
Elizabeth Johnson (City of Alameda)	X	X		X	X	**	**	*		X	X	
Marcia Liao (DTSC)			*	X		X	X	X	X	X	*	
Laurent Meillier (RWQCB)												
Patricia Ryan (DTSC)	X	X	X	X	X	X			X			
Sophia Serda (EPA)					**							
Michael Shields (USCG)								X	X	X	X	
Merry Goodenough (USCG)									X			

* Denotes excused absense

U.S. NAVY	JAN	FEB	MARCH	APRIL	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC
Glenna Clark										X		
Andrew Dick	**			X	X			X	X		X	
Steve Edde	X	X	X	X			X		X		X	
Greg Lorton							X					
Mike McClelland	X	X	X	X		**	X	X	X	X	X	
Tom Pinard	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Rick Weissenborn	X			X	X	X	X			X		
TETRA TECH EMI	JAN	FEB	MARCH	APRIL	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC
Courtney Colvin	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Tracy Craig	X	X	X			X		X	X	X	X	
Chris Fennessy						X			X			
Jim Helge						X						
Craig Hunter										X		
Marie Rainwater												
Leah Waller	X	X	X									
Corinne Crawley				X								

* Denotes excused absense

OTHER	JAN	FEB	MARCH	APRIL	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC
Charlene Washington-EBCRC												
Janet Argyres-Bechtel					X							
Bart Draper-Bechtel												
Stephen Quayle-Bechtel												
Bruce Marvin - IT, Aquifer Solutions	X											
Rezsine Jaulus-Alameda Point Coll.				X		X		X	X	X	X	
Eric Johansen - Bechtel					X							
Ron Rinehart, Pacific States			X	X	X	X	X	X				
Aidan Barry - APCP					X	X	X					
Bill Howell - 3-D Environmental					X	X						
Lee Dodge - LFR							X		X	X		

* Excused absence

** Attended but did not sign roster

* Denotes excused absence



TRANSMITTAL/DELIVERABLE RECEIPT

Contract No. N68711-00-D-0005

Document Control No. TC . A021 . 10074

TO: Mr. Ron Fuller, Code 02R1.RF
Contracting Officer
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Southwest Division
1230 Columbia Street, Suite 1100
San Diego, CA 92101-8517

DATE: 04/03/03
DO: 021
LOCATION: Alameda Point, Alameda, California

FROM:


Michael Wanta, Contract Manager

DOCUMENT TITLE AND DATE:

Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Summaries for 2002, April 2, 2003

TYPE: ☐ Contractual Deliverable ☐ Technical Deliverable (DS) ☒ Other (TC)

VERSION: NA REVISION #: NA
(e.g., Draft, Draft Final, Final)

ADMIN RECORD: Yes ☒ No ☐ CATEGORY: Confidential ☐

SCHEDULED DELIVERY DATE: NA ACTUAL DELIVERY DATE: 04/03/03

NUMBER OF COPIES SUBMITTED TO NAVY: O/3C/4E

O = original transmittal form
C = copy of transmittal form
E = enclosure

COPIES TO: (Include Name, Navy Mail Code, and Number of Copies)

NAVY:

M. McClelland (06Camm)

O/1E

Diane Silva (05G.DS)*

3C/3E

TETRA TECH:

File/Doc Control

1C/1E (w/QC)

Courtney Colvin

1C/1E

OTHER:

Date/Time Received